

Remarks

Claims 23 and 24 have been rewritten in independent form. Claim 6 has been amended to address an informality. Favorable reconsideration is requested in view of the amendments and following remarks. Claims 3, 5, 6, 9, 19, 20, 23, and 24 are pending, with claims 3, 19, 23, and 24 being independent.

Interview Summary

Applicants appreciate the courtesy extended by the Examiner to Applicants' representatives, Matthew A. Doscotch and Robert A. Kalinsky, during the interview on August 11, 2004. During the interview, claim 1 and the following references were discussed: Atemboski et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,443,726; Sinsley, U.S. Patent No. 6,361,725; and Moore et al., U.S. Patent No. 3,758,317. Agreement regarding the allowability of the claims was not reached. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

Rejection Based on Shimek '237 and Sinsley '725

In section 5 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 10-18, 21, 22, 25, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimek et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,941,237, in view of Sinsley, U.S. Patent No. 6,361,725. This rejection is respectfully traversed, and the correctness of the rejection is not conceded.

However, claims 1, 2, 10-18, 21, 22, 25, and 26 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer, to place the application into condition for allowance. Therefore, this rejection is now moot. Applicants expressly reserve the right to pursue claims 1, 2, 10-18, 21, 22, 25, and 26 in future prosecution. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejection Based on Shimek '237 and Moore '317

In section 6 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 10-18, 21, 22, 25, and 26 were rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimek '237 in view of Moore et al., U.S. Patent No. 3,758,317. This rejection is respectfully traversed, and the correctness of the rejection is not conceded.

However, claims 1, 2, 10-18, 21, 22, 25, and 26 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer, to place the application into condition for allowance. Therefore, this rejection is now moot. Applicants expressly reserve the right to pursue claims 1, 2, 10-18, 21, 22, 25, and 26 in future prosecution. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's notification in sections 7 and 8 of the Action that claims 3, 5, 6, 9, 19, and 20 are allowed, and that claims 23 and 24 are allowable. All claims should be in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested. The Examiner is encourage to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney, at the below listed telephone number, to discuss this matter if any questions arise upon further examination of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
612.371.5271

Date: October 1 . 2004

By: Matthew A. Doscotch
Name: Matthew A. Doscotch
Reg. No. 48,957
MAD/RAK